DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 330 162 EC 300 134

AUTHOR Kennedy, Sylvia
TITLE The Regular Education Initiative in the Anchorage Public Schools.
PUB DATE 90
NOTE 47p.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Attitudes; Consultation Programs; *Disabilities; Educational Change; Elementary Secondary Education; Knowledge Level; Mainstreaming; *Principals; Public Schools; *Regular and Special Education Relationship
IDENTIFIERS Anchorage School District AK

ABSTRACT

The study examined the number of Anchorage (Alaska) public schools that are using the Regular Education Initiative (REI) concept in their special education programs and the attitudes of building principals concerning both REI and collaborative consultation. Surveys mailed to 65 principals yielded a return of 30 questionnaires (6 secondary and 24 elementary). Introductory sections examine the origins of the REI and the meanings of REI and collaborative consultation. A review of related literature addresses reasons for REI enactment. Noted in the review are possible difficulties in implementing the program, including new roles for educators and educator discomfort with the consultation process. Analysis of questionnaire results found that two-thirds of principals claimed familiarity with REI, 76.6% already had special education students being taught in the regular classroom, and 50% claimed familiarity with collaborative consultation. Most of the principals agreed that: special education students can be educated in a regular classroom; regular education teachers can be responsible for special education students; the least restrictive environment can be a self-contained classroom; labeling diminishes self-worth; and there is too much duplication of services between Chapter I, special education, bilingual, and migrant services. Contains 17 references. (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED330162

THE REGULAR EDUCATION INITIATIVE IN THE ANCHORAGE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Sylvia Kennedy

Education 627

Dr. Ralph Van Dusseldorp

Spring, 1990

FC 300134

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Sylvia Kennedy
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 1

BACKGROUND OF THE PROBLEM 1

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM 3

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE PROBLEM 4

DEFINITION OF TERMS 4

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE 5

REASONS FOR ENACTMENT 6

POSSIBLE DIFFICULTIES IN IMPLEMENTING THE PROGRAM 16

A DESCRIPTION OF A MODEL 18

SUMMARY 19

METHODS AND PROCEDURES 21

RESULTS 22

TABLE I - Responses of Building Principals
To Regular Education Initiative 23

SUMMARY OF RESULTS 26

CONCLUSIONS 28

TABLE II - Secondary Administrators - Results 30

TABLE III - Elementary Administrators - Results 33

RECOMMENDATIONS 36

BIBLIOGRAPHY 38

INTRODUCTION

BACKGROUND OF THE PROBLEM

Special Education in the American school system has experienced rapid growth. In 1976-1977 3.7 million students were certified for special education; in 1986-1987 4.4 million were certified. This was a nineteen percent increase. The learning disability category alone increased 140 percent. The reasons for this rapid growth include improved assessment procedures, liberal eligibility criteria, social acceptability for the learning disabled classification, and a lack of regular alternatives for children who experience problems in regular classes. It is estimated that ninety percent of the special education population is mildly handicapped. Many believe that half the children labeled learning disabled are actually slow learners, from bilingual families, conduct disordered, truant, or average in above average districts.

The current delivery systems for special education services include pull-out programs featuring resource rooms and self-contained classrooms. Despite the individualization and frequent contact between students and teachers, the dropout rate among the learning disabled is estimated at fifty percent. Zigmond (as cited in O'Neil 1988) from the University of Pittsburgh noted it is higher with learning disabled students than with marginal kids.

> These students need basic reading and functional math. They needs lessons in "survival skills" and preparation for work. Vocational training must include social skills. The Learning Disabled need to be able to get along with employees and supervisors. [O'Neil, 1988. p.3.]

Special education students have problems keeping up with their peers. They are the bottom-of-the-barrel; their percentile ranks are often below ten percent in reading, writing, and math. The tenth grade student is often on the fourth grade level. It is difficult for them to generalize skills and content to another lesson.

In November, 1986, Madeleine Will, the Assistant Secretary, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitation, Services of the United States Department of Education, presented a report to the secretary. It introduced the Regular Education Initiative. Will proposed that the regular classroom be adapted so the special education student can learn. A partnership of special education and regular education teachers must form so appropriate teaching techniques, curricula, and strategies can be developed. In this model the mildly handicapped special education student is taught in the regular classroom. The special education instructor and support (aides, counselors, therapists) go into the regular classroom to render their services. The special education instructor does team teaching, tutoring, small group work, direct instruction, and serves as a consultant to the regular education instructor. In this manner the entire class benefits and

the teacher-pupil ratio is lowered. The regular education teacher benefits from special education expertise. Other slow learners receive special education services without being labeled. The special education students have higher achieving models in their peers. Students in this delivery model aren't distracted by the confusion which results from classroom changes necessary in pull-out programs.

Public Law 94-142 which was enacted in 1975 uses the term "least restrictive environment." It is interpreted to mean that as much as possible, students be educated with their peers.

STATEMENT OF PROBLEM

The purpose of this study was to determine the number of Anchorage schools that are using the Regular Education Initiative concept in their special education programs, and the attitudes of building principals concerning both Regular Education Initiative and Collaborative Consultation.

An instrument was prepared for each administrator to determine their knowledge concerning the definition of the Regular Education Initiative and subsequently the status of the Regular Education Initiative in their school.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE PROBLEM

The fact that students educated in pull-out and self contained delivery systems have met with so little success, and the increased demand for special education services all indicate that Regular Education Initiative is an area worthy of study.

A need has arisen in the Anchorage area for an evaluation of what is happening with the Regular Education Initiative locally. This delivery system does have its proponents. During the 1986-1987 school year nine elementary schools volunteered to develop new models in the Anchorage School System.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

The Regular Education Initiative is not collaborative consultation. It is a public policy that encourages sharing of expertise and resources among general and special educators in an effort to encourage mutual responsibility for the educationally handicapped. Collaborative consultation is just one part of Regular Education Initiative; collaborative consultation existed before the Regular Education Initiative.

Brown, Wyne, Blackburn, and Powell, 1979, stated that school consultation, which is an integral part of the Regular Education Initiative, is a process based upon an equal relationship characterized by a mutual trust and open

communication, joint approaches to problem identification, the pooling of personal resources to identify and select strategies that will have some probability of solving the problem that has been identified, and shared responsibility in the implementation and evaluation of the program or strategy that has been initiated. [Brown, Wyne, Blackburn & Powell, 1979.]

Collaborative consultation is an interactive process which enables people with diverse expertise to generate creative solutions to mutually defined problems. The outcome is enhanced, altered and different from the original solutions that any team member would produce independently. The major outcome of collaborative consultation is to provide comprehensive and effective programs for students with special needs within the most appropriate context, thereby enabling them to achieve with their non-handicapped peer. [Idal Paolucei, Whitcomb, & Nevin, 1986.]

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The literature found concerning the Regular Education Initiative defines it and its components. The reasons for implementing this model are given. The role of administration is addressed. Possible difficulties which could surface are noted. An example model is also given. The literature is current with 1984 being

the least current publication. There is much available in this field; the literature reviewed is what is accessible at the present time.

REASONS FOR ENACTMENT

The COLLABORATIVE EDUCATOR listed the following reasons for enactment:

A. Provide increased instruction within classroom rather than the pull-out setting.

B. Empower building principals.

C. Promote sharing among personnel involved in new "model" development. [Sileo, Johnson, 1987.]

A review for administrators discusses the issue of empowering building principals. The administrator's leadership role between special education and other central office services involves a commitment to be responsive and to share the responsibility and the resources needed to implement such a program. It also involves commitment to support quality special education, teaching personnel to share their skills and knowledge in the education of handicapped learners. [Greenburg, 1987.]

In the Greenburg review Sage in 1981 stated that special education administrators must specialize their skills and work with a broader focus.

Administrators must provide supervision consultation, demonstrations, and in-services. [Robson, 1981.]

Greenburg (1987) notes that adequate supervision includes evaluation of general education, special education, and direct service. The supervisor needs to be familiar with current research on teacher effectiveness. Usually the general or regular education administrator does the evaluations of both special and regular education programs because they are done at the building level. In this case, special education administrative personnel need to help the evaluating administrator develop a supervision and evaluation program for special education personnel. A different type of supervision is often needed in consultation or resource models than in a self contained classroom.

The report to the secretary, "Educating Students With Learning Problems, a Shared Responsibility" [Will, November, 1986] has been the driving force in the enactment of the Regular Education Initiative in the United States. Within this report is stated that principals must be empowered to control all programs and resources. Since help for students can come only if the handicapped learner is eligible for special education, failure must occur before services. An early intervention model could work on the problem before it occurs.

Principals are constrained by rules and regulations. Current regulations prevent special education from giving service in the regular classroom in many

areas. An example was given in Will's 1986 report of a learning disability instructor and a language arts educator serving handicapped learners, who were not labeled. In the six years the program existed only two students needed special education. In the three years prior to the program eighteen students were referred to the special education. The program was terminated because it did not qualify for funds.

Literature written on "effective schools" shows that change starts at the building level. The principal must be the leader, the catalyst. Principals set expectations; the administrator's leadership must be established; he or she must get the staff to work together to build educational plans.

Building based changes intended to modify referral habits have been successful. The administrator must be active in the planning process with regular, special education, and the other support staff. If the building principal is empowered, he or she will be able to introduce and advocate for the consulting teacher models, teacher assistance teams and cooperative learning. These strategies provide options for all children. (Will, 1986)

Greenburg (1987) has prepared a list of "musts" for administrators. They are as follows:

1. Administrators must help special education and regular education design programs and service.

2. Administrators must enact procedures that assure optimal development and use of general or regular education resources with regular educators who have special education resources, expertise, and methodology where needed.

3. The administrator must support building based and itinerant staff in team efforts and teacher assistance and personnel development.

4. The administrator must do a follow up. The impact of the program must be evaluated. In-service programs must be on-going.

Often students are stigmatized by removal from class for special education. Parents feel the school is unwilling to help. This is a reason for the student receiving increased instruction in the regular classroom rather than a pull-out setting. [Will, 1986.]

Insufficient amount and inefficient use of time is detrimental to students. Studies indicate some schools have only seventeen hours per week of active instruction; the average is twenty-two. This is the time utilized in a thirty-hour week.

Wang, Reynolds, and Wallberg wrote a position paper entitled "Reflections In Research and Practice In Special Education" which appeared in JOURNAL OF LEARNING DISABILITIES. In this article the following was stated: "The pull-out approach is driven by fallacy. It encourages poor student adjustment and

performance. It blames failure on the student rather than the quality of the learning environment." [Wang, Reynolds, & Wallberg, 1987.]

The classification system, or labeling as it is called, is ineffective. The regulation governing the pull-out programs curbs the staff's initiative to serve students. Mastery learning, adaptive education, school based home enrichment are not used. The use of these strategies would enable students to remain in regular classrooms. There is an overlap of special education services, Chapter I, migrant, and bilingual programs. The program should serve all mildly handicapped learners, not just classified.

THE JOURNAL OF LEARNING DISABILITIES [May 1987] also carried a summary of an article that appeared in the forum section of Educational Week on December 4, 1985. This is credited to the National Coalition of Advocates for Students and the National Association of School Psychologists. These are more reasons for the enactment of the Regular Education Initiative. Labels are irrelevant to the needs of students. After labels are given, student expectations are reduced. Assessment of students is used only to determine eligibility for special education. Currently national educational standards are being raised, putting more children at risk of failure. The group expressed the following statements:

a. All children can learn and the schools are responsible for teaching them.

b. Instruction based on needs must be maximized in General Education.

c. Student needs are to be determined by a non-biased assessment process.

d. Schools must serve at-risk students without handicap classification. Changes should be made cautiously, making the system less rigid but still keeping Public Law 94-142.

There are problems in our current special education system. The referral process is complex and costly. Questions often arise about its validity. It over identifies students. The efficiency of pull-out programs are in question. Special education has the most cumbersome and complex regulations. There are conflicting rules for different programs. Special education, Chapter 1, remedial, bilingual, and migrant programs are all duplicating programs. These regulations prohibit consultation, testing and due process. Time is lost between referral and placement. One single coordinated system is preferable to the array of special programs currently offered. [Lilly, 1986.]

"How Special Should Special Education Curriculum Be" (O'Neil, 1988) gives some more reasons for the enactment of the Regular Education Initiative. Often the curriculum in the special education program is fuzzy with an Individual Education Plan. Often there are no constraints. The regular elementary classroom can teach a child how to behave and get along with his/her peers and

the teacher. They also often do a better job of reinforcement in basic skills. The curriculum is the same, only in special education it is broken down into smaller units. It should be good, straightforward, direct instruction. Transition is often difficult into high school. This is because the curriculum becomes more content oriented. The handicapped learner often lacks skills needed for success in the mainstream.

Edgar of the University of Washington at Seattle stated, "School reform will force special educators to spend even more energy on getting mildly handicapped students through the required academic courses and less time on career and vocational experiences." [Cited in O'Neil, 1988, p.3.]

Jane McGlothlin, Director of Special Programs in the Kyrene School District at Tempe, Arizona, states, "Content is not taught! The students are pulled out of social studies and science. The result is students without a general education. Science and Social Studies should be used for skill application." [Cited in O'Neil, 1988, p. 6.]

The Harvard Education Review mentioned that Allen Gartner and Dorothy Kerzner Kipsky of City University in New York "...described a 'disabling' view of handicapped students that 'adversely affects expectations regarding their academic achievement. It causes them to be separated from other students, to be exposed to a watered-down curriculum, to be allowed grades that they have

not learned; and in some states to be permitted special diplomas'." [Cited in O'Neil, 1988, p. 6.]

There is a need to reorganize the system to serve the disabled. In an article "Let Us Pause and Reflect -- But Not Too Long," it is noted the progress made in the past ten years, progress unattainable and unthinkable a few years ago. Public Law 94-142 ushered in a creative period. Small group and individual instruction, Individual Education Plans and technology to overcome communication barriers are all measures that have proved innovative. [Will, 1984.]

The underlying and basic premise in a concept of excellence means striving to reach one's utmost potential. Bell puts out a call for national evaluation of education appropriate to the agenda of civil rights, goals in the disability area. There is a need to examine the educational system to services for the disabled. [Bell as cited by Will, 1984, p. 12.]

Will states "It's a challenge to the will and character. We must look beyond the traditional. We must improve services to older handicapped children. More coordination is needed between vocational rehabilitation and special education."

There are four barriers to progress:

1. There is a barrier between special and regular education.
2. Full integration of the handicapped into our society needs to occur.
3. There is a barrier between the nursery and the school.

4. The barrier between school and work place.

Regular and special education has been artificially compartmentalized. Special education is often defined according to the characteristics of the children served rather than the special instruction and services. The integrated systems are unequal. Thirty years ago Chief Justice Warren stated referring to integrated systems "generates a feeling of inferiority as to their [children's] status in the community that may affect their hearts and minds in a way unlikely ever to be undone." He also linked this to educational consequences. "The sense of inferiority affects the motivation of a child to learn and therefore has a tendency to retard." [Will, 1984, p. 13.]

More restrictive is not acceptable. It builds a barrier between the school and the work place. Joblessness is often the norm with the disabled. In follow-up studies it is found that joblessness results in social isolation, dependence, poverty, family disruption, behavior disorders and difficulty in establishing a personal adult identity. These are barriers to independent living, transportation, and use of leisure time. Education gets the student ready for transition into regular life. The student should not be forced to make career choices before he or she is ready.

Handicapped learners use inefficient trial and error learning methods to solve problems. They need to set goals, and learn to select and use strategies, self monitor and evaluate. In a later report to the Secretary of Education entitled

"Educating Students With Learning Problems," the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (Will, 1986) studies show that special education expertise can be used in the regular classroom. Pilot programs are preferable to "quick-fix" instructional approaches. Teaching practices successful with average students are not successful with special education students. Some approaches that have proven successful are curricula geared to individual needs and styles, use of computers that keep track of student progress, reduced class size, increased time in school or more efficient time use. Instruction in social skills is also necessary. School personnel need in-service and new programs. The pilot programs should be systematically and rigorously supervised and documented. Children's rights must not be denied. The new programs set up must be a competency based approach. The staff needs in-service. Participants should be offered incentives, released-time, career ladders, and college credit.

The Office of Special Education and Rehabilitation Services (OSERS) has made funding available for research, model demonstrations, evaluations, and training to assist in experimentation. The office does not advocate block grants, commingling, or increasing funding. The experimentation must be conducted under the guidelines of Public Law 94-142.

There is no child who can't learn. Each requires a personalized education. The basic issue is not to label, but to provide programs that allow them to learn better. [Will, 1986.]

POSSIBLE DIFFICULTIES IN IMPLEMENTING THE PROGRAM:

Often the special education department takes over, so the regular education instructors gladly give over their special education students. Building cooperation between regular education and special education to help students face obstacles is necessary. [Will, 1986.]

Greenburg noted that enactment of the Regular Education Initiative made many educators change roles. Many of the special education instructors want to be with special education students. Staff may feel it is a disruption to the comfortable. This is found in studies by Brown, Kiraly, and McKennon (1979), Evans (1980), McGlothlin in 1981. McLaughlin and Kelly (1982), and Miller and Sabatino in 1978 found that teachers wishing more contact with students were attracted to resource rooms. They also found that record keeping, paperwork, and teacher consultant services took more time than educators believed. Salvia and Yesseldyke in 1978 found that a special education instructor's job entailed a combination of duties and diagnostic skills.

Lamb and Burrello (1979) and Sage and Burrello (1986) found that the individuals introducing the concept may have problems. They may find themselves shifting from a developer and programmer to monitor and defender. In this situation they may become defensive, reactive, uncomfortable, unfamiliar, unrewarded.

Cherniss (1985) found a teacher who felt admired and respected a resource teacher, but in the consultation role the regular educators felt they were responsible for increasing their work load and were making them do the special educator's job. It proved to be increased conflict and stress for all involved.

Williams and Algozzine, (1979) found that many regular educators would not participate because they did not feel they had enough technical ability. They were also concerned that it would take too much time from regular education. This points out a need for general education teachers to develop strategies in educating handicapped learners. The National Council provide training for all graduates so they are prepared to provide education to the handicapped. Warger and Trippe [1982] found that some types of handicaps are more accepted in regular education than others. Emotionally disturbed are least accepted. If regular classroom teachers are allowed a supported classroom experience with handicapped students, attitudes often change. These attitudes will determine the success or failure of the model. Greenburg also noted that handicapped learners

require a different pace structure, more instructional time, more supervision and more instructional time. They often need modified tests and supplementary materials. Small group and individual learning are also needed.

Will (1984) listed these drawbacks. Regular Education has little expertise to help with learning problems. This is where the child failed first. There is a lack of teaching techniques, curricula, strategies. Regular education and special education must form a partnership.

Regular education has often been unwilling to modify curriculum and programs. There has been a dramatic reduction in the range of abilities in the children remaining in regular education. Programs that are productive need expansion. Some rules and regulations must be waived. Decisions should be made at a local level. We need to mix the categories. There has been too much division and labeling. New curriculum must be developed that can serve mildly handicapped as well as regular students. Adaptive Learning Environments, Model and Teacher Assistance teams are suggested. Costs may be inhibitive when starting new programs.

A DESCRIPTION OF A MODEL

An article entitled "Integrating Students With Special Needs In Regular Classes. Teacher Roles and Student Outcomes At the Secondary Level" by

Joanne Peterson, Judy Nielson, Pam Dahl, John Johnson, Eddy Nystrom, and Eva D. Vaughn (1985) describes the model as used in the Montevideo Public Schools for grades ten through twelve. The program was started in 1982. The following groups were integrated: learning disabled, mild mental retardation, regular education, and bilingual. It involved thirty-five handicapped learners. The special educators were involved in developing and refining the regular education curriculum. There was increased communication between special and regular education in the system.

SUMMARY

The reasons for enactment of the Regular Education Initiative are to provide increased instruction in classroom rather than pull-out programs and to promote sharing among personnel. Students will not be stigmatized by removal from class using this model. Labeling, which has been proven ineffective, will not be necessary. Regular Education Initiative will eliminate overlapping of special education, Chapter I, migrant and bilingual programs. More time is available for the students and it can be used more appropriately.

All children can learn and schools are responsible for teaching them. Student needs should be determined through non-biased assessment. Instruction should be based on needs. Handicapped learners use inefficient trial and error

learning methods. Teaching practices which have been successful with regular education are not successful with special education students. The Office of Special Education and Rehabilitation Services has made funding available for research, demonstrations, evaluation and training.

Building principals must be empowered. They must assume leadership roles. Administrators must be committed to be responsive and share responsibility and resources. Quality special education must be supported. Principals must specialize their skills and work with a broader focus. They are obligated to provide consultation, demonstrations, and in-services. Administrators must be familiar with current research. Changes start at the building level. The principal must be the catalyst. Follow-ups on in-services and programs must be done.

Possible difficulties that would cause problems in program implementation are as follows:

The special education department often takes over. The Regular Education Initiative can cause uncomfortable role changes. Many regular educators will not participate because they feel they lack expertise. There is a lack of confidence in regular education because it is where the child failed first. Regular education has often been unwilling to modify curriculum. Some rules and regulations, especially

individual funding must be waived in order to enact the new model. The costs to make the changes necessary could inhibit implementation of the model.

A short overview of the Montevideo model is also included.

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

A questionnaire was formulated by the researcher. A preliminary draft contained three questions which could be answered with a yes or no, and twenty-two Likert type questions. The scale used was as follows: Strongly Agree, Agree, Undecided, Disagree, Strongly Disagree. The purpose of this questionnaire was to determine principals' knowledge of Regular Education Initiative and to assess the attitudes they held which were related to this subject. The final questionnaire was reduced to twenty questions allowing it to be printed on two pages; yes or no questions were eliminated.

The questionnaire was pretested on ten secondary principals in the Anchorage school system. This preliminary testing yielded a fifty per cent return in the first week. This indicated that a follow up might be needed with the regular sample to ensure the highest rate of return possible. One questionnaire came in later, raising the return rate to sixty percent.

The results were compiled from fifty-five questionnaires which had been sent to all the principals of the elementary schools in Anchorage. Each envelope

contained a cover letter, a stamped self addressed envelope, and the two page questionnaire. Copies of the cover letter and the questionnaire are found in the appendices. The questionnaires were sent out April 3rd with an April 12th deadline. Reminder phone calls were made April 10th. Twenty-four questionnaires were returned prior to the compiling of results. Two were not included because of late arrival.

RESULTS

Building principals' responses to the Likert type scale questions are listed on Table I. Questions 13 through 16 were yes and no responses and write in. Results for Questions 13, 14, 15, and 16 are as follows:

13. Are you familiar with the Regular Education Initiative? 10 - no's; 20 - yes's, which comes to 33.3 percent No and 66.6 percent yes answers.

14. Are your special education students being taught in the regular classroom? Six did not respond for 19.9 percent; one No for 3.3 percent; 23 yes's for 76.6 percent.

15. If so, for what subjects? The elementary principals stated their special education students were mainstreamed in all subjects depending on student needs in fifteen schools. One school mainstreams in all subjects except Language Arts; five schools mainstream in Physical Education, Music, Science,

Social Studies, and Library. One administrator reported that very few of their special education students were mainstreamed, and then only in Language Arts.

Secondary administrators stated that special education placement in regular classrooms according to the needs of the student took place in five of the six responding surveys.

16. Are you familiar with collaborative consultation? Three principals did not respond, which is ten percent. Twelve answered no, which is forty percent, and fifteen marked yes, which is fifty percent.

Table I
Responses of Building Principals
To Regular Education Initiative
Questionnaire

Possible responses on a 0-5 scale: 0 - no response; 1 - strongly disagree; 2 - disagree; 3 - undecided; 4 - agree; 5 - strongly agree

	QUESTIONS	RESPONSES						
		0	1	2	3	4	5	
1	Special education students can be educated in a regular classroom with assistance from the special education department.	1 3.3	1 3.3	1 3.3	2 6.6	17 56.6	8 26.6	# %
2	Regular education teachers can be responsible for special education students.	1 3.3	1 3.3	1 3.3	7 23.3	16 53.3	4 13.3	# %

	QUESTIONS	RESPONSES						
		0	1	2	3	4	5	
3	Least restrictive environment can be a self-contained classroom.	0 0	0 0	2 6.6	1 3.3	14 46.6	5 43.3	# %
4	Special education teachers in my building are protective of their students.	3 10	3 10	5 16.6	2 6.6	11 36.6	6 20	# %
5	An emotionally disturbed child can function only in a self-contained classroom.	1 3.3	7 23.3	11 36.6	4 13.3	5 16.6	2 6.6	# %
6	I believe labeling diminishes student self worth.	1 3.3	2 6.6	3 10	5 16.6	12 40	7 23.3	# %
7	I believe in-services are valuable for my staff.	0 0	0 0	3 10	0 0	11 36.6	16 53.3	# %
8	A principal must be knowledgeable in the area of current research.	1 3.3	0 0	0 0	0 0	10 33.3	19 63.3	# %
9	My staff work well with each other.	0 0	0 0	2 6.6	1 3.3	6 20	21 70	# %
10	Children model the behavior of other children.	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	15 50	15 50	# %
11	Learning disabled students who have spatial and time orientation problems would profit from not having to go to a resource room.	0 0	3 10	13 43.3	3 10	8 26.6	3 10	# %

	QUESTIONS	RESPONSES						
		0	1	2	3	4	5	
12	There is too much duplication of services between Chapter I, special education, bilingual and migrant services.	0 0	4 13.3	5 16.6	4 13.3	12 40	5 16.6	# %
17	I feel too much staff money and resources has been allocated for this program.	12 40	5 16.6	8 26.6	4 13.3	0 0	1 3.3	# %
18	Scheduling difficulties make it impossible to enact Regular Education Initiative.	13 43.3	3 10	4 13.3	5 16.6	5 16.6	0 0	# %
19	Other support personnel (therapists) could take their services into a regular classroom.	11 36.6	1 3.3	4 13.3	1 3.3	11.3 6.6	2 6.6	# %
20	My teachers would be uneasy about consultants from the special education department spending time teaching and consulting.	11 36.6	7 23.3	11 36.6	1 3.3	0 0	0 0	# %

SUMMARY OF RESULTS

Based on the results of the Regular Education Initiative questionnaire, approximately two-thirds of the responding principals are familiar with the Regular Education Initiative. Seventy-seven percent of the special education students in schools administered by responding principals are being taught in the regular classroom part of the day. The amount of time in the regular class and the subjects they take vary according to the student's individual education plan.

Collaborative Consultation was familiar to fifty percent of the administrators. The responding principals surveyed expressed the following attitudes:

1. Most building administrators either agree or strongly agree that special education students can be educated in a regular classroom.
2. Most building principals (53.3 percent) agree that regular education teachers can be responsible for special education students. A number (23.3 percent) were undecided about this and 13.3 percent strongly disagreed.
3. Most responding principals felt that the least restrictive environment can be a self-contained classroom.
4. About 56.6 percent of the administrators felt their special education teachers were protective of their students; 27.6 percent felt the special education teachers were not protective of their students, and

16.6 percent were either undecided or did not respond to that question.

5. Most principals disagreed with the statement that an emotionally disturbed child can function only in a self-contained classroom.
6. Most building administrators believe labeling diminishes self worth.
7. Most of those surveyed believe in-services are valuable for their staff.
8. Most building principals strongly agree that they need to be knowledgeable in the area of current research.
9. Seventy percent of those surveyed felt their staff worked well together.
10. All agreed that children modeled other children. Fifty percent agreed and fifty percent strongly agreed.
11. Most principals disagreed with the idea that learning disabled students who have spatial and time orientation problems would profit from not having to go to a resource room.
12. Fifty-seven percent of the survey respondents felt there is too much duplication of services between Chapter I, special education, bilingual, and migrant services.

Those who answered no to questions 13 through 16 were not asked to complete questions 17 through 20. This accounts for the 36.6 percent to 43.3 percent non-response rate.

17. Most principals disagreed with the idea that too much staff, money, and resources has been allocated for this program.
18. Opinions on scheduling difficulties were varied. Most did not respond to this question.
19. Most principals believed that other support personnel (therapists) could take their services into a regular classroom.
20. All responding principals but one disagreed with the statement, "My teachers would be uneasy about consultants from the special education department spending time teaching and consulting."

CONCLUSIONS

The Regular Education Initiative is not unfamiliar to most of the responding principals. Most special education students (over 75 percent) are being mainstreamed in the regular classroom part of the day. Collaborative Consultation is familiar to half the responding principals.

The following attitudes and statements are agreed upon:

1. Special education students can be educated in a regular classroom.

2. Regular education teachers can be responsible for special education students.
3. The least restrictive environment can be a self-contained classroom for some students.
4. Special education teachers are protective of their students.
5. Labeling diminishes self worth.
6. Administrators need to be knowledgeable in the area of current research.
7. Their staff work well with one another.
8. Children model other children.
9. There is too much duplication of services between Chapter I, special education, bilingual, and migrant services.
10. Other support personnel (therapists) could take their services into a regular classroom.

These statements were disagreed with:

1. An emotionally disturbed child can function only in a self-contained classroom.
2. Learning disabled students who have spatial and time orientation problems would profit from not having to go to a resource room.

3. Too much staff, money, and resources has been allocated for this program.

4. My teachers would be uneasy about consultants from the special education department spending time teaching and consulting.

Opinions on scheduling difficulties were varied. Most did not respond to this question.

Table II
Secondary Administrators - Results

Responses on a 0-5 scale:

0 - no response; 1 - strongly disagree;
2 - disagree; 3 - undecided;
4 - agree; 5 - strongly agree

	QUESTIONS	RESPONSES						
		0	1	2	3	4	5	
1	Special education students can be educated in a regular classroom with assistance from the special education department.	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	5 83.3	1 16.6	# %
2	Regular education teachers can be responsible for special education students.	1 16.6	0 0	0 0	1 16.6	4 66.6	0 0	# %

	QUESTIONS	RESPONSES						
		0	1	2	3	4	5	
3	Least restrictive environment can be a self-contained classroom.	0 0	0 0	1 16.6	1 16.6	3 50	1 16.6	# %
4	Special education teachers in my building are protective of their students.	1 16.6	0 0	2 33.3	1 16.6	1 16.6	1 16.6	# %
5	An emotionally disturbed child can function only in a self-contained classroom.	0 0	0 0	3 50	0 0	2 33.3	1 16.6	# %
6	I believe labeling diminishes student self worth.	0 0	1 16.6	0 0	1 16.6	3 50	1 16.6	# %
7	I believe in-services are valuable for my staff.	0 0	0 0	1 16.6	0 0	5 83.3	0 0	# %
8	A principal must be knowledgeable in the area of current research.	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	2 33.3	4 66.6	# %
9	My staff work well with each other.	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	1 16.6 7	5 83.3	# %
10	Children model the behavior of other children.	0 0	0 0	1 16.6	0 0	3 50	2 33.3	# %
11	Learning disabled students who have spatial and time orientation problems would profit from not having to go to a resource room.	0 0	0 0	2 33.3	0 0	4 66.6	0 0	# %

	QUESTIONS	RESPONSES						
		0	1	2	3	4	5	
12	There is too much duplication of services between Chapter I, special education, bilingual and migrant services.	0 0	0 0	1 16.6	0 0	4 83.3	1 16.6	# %
17	I feel too much staff money and resources has been allocated for this program.	2 33.3	0 0	4 66.6	0 0	0 0	0 0	# %
18	Scheduling difficulties make it impossible to enact Regular Education Initiative.	2 33.3	0 0	1 16.6	1 16.6	2 33.3	0 0	# %
19	Other support personnel (therapists) could take their services into a regular classroom.	2 33.3	0 0	0 0	0 0	4 66.6	0 0	# %
20	My teachers would be uneasy about consultants from the special education department spending time teaching and consulting.	2 33.3	4 66.6	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	# %

Table III
Elementary Administrators - Results

Responses on a 0-5 scale:

0 - no response; 1 - strongly disagree;
2 - disagree; 3 - undecided;
4 - agree; 5 - strongly agree

	QUESTIONS	RESPONSES						
		0	1	2	3	4	5	
1	Special education students can be educated in a regular classroom with assistance from the special education department.	1 4.2	1 4.2	1 4.2	2 8.3	12 50	7 29.1	# %
2	Regular education teachers can be responsible for special education students.	0 0	1 4.2	1 4.2	6 25	12 50	4 16.7	# %
3	Least restrictive environment can be a self-contained classroom.	0 0	0 0	1 4.2	0 0	11 45.8	12 50	# %
4	Special education teachers in my building are protective of their students.	2 8.3	3 12.5	3 12.5	1 4.2	10 41.7	5 20.8	# %
5	An emotionally disturbed child can function only in a self-contained classroom.	1 4.2	7 29.1	8 33.3	4 16.6	3 12.5	1 4.2	# %
6	I believe labeling diminishes student self worth.	1 4.2	1 4.2	3 12.5	4 16.7	9 37.5	6 25	# %
7	I believe in-services are valuable for my staff.	0 0	0 0	2 8.3	0 0	6 25	16 66.6	# %

	QUESTIONS	RESPONSES						
		0	1	2	3	4	5	
8	A principal must be knowledgeable in the area of current research.	1 4.2	0 0	0 0	0 0	8 33.3	15 62.5	# %
9	My staff work well with each other.	0 0	0 0	2 8.3	1 4.2	5 20.8	16 66.7	# %
10	Children model the behavior of other children.	0 0	0 0	0 0	0 0	11 45.8	13 54.1	# %
11	Learning disabled students who have spatial and time orientation problems would profit from not having to go to a resource room.	1 4.2	0 0	1 4.2	1 4.2	9 37.5	12 50	# %
12	There is too much duplication of services between Chapter I, special education, bilingual and migrant services.	0 0	3 12.5	9 37.5	3 12.5	6 25	3 12.5	# %
17	I feel too much staff money and resources has been allocated for this program.	9 37.5	4 16.7	7 29.2	3 12.5	0 0	1 4.2	# %
18	Scheduling difficulties make it impossible to enact Regular Education Initiative.	10 41.7	3 12.5	3 12.5	4 16.6	4 16.6	0 0	# %
19	Other support personnel (therapists) could take their services into a regular classroom.	9 37.5	1 4.2	4 16.7	1 4.2	7 29.2	2 8.3	# %

	QUESTIONS	RESPONSES						
		0	1	2	3	4	5	
20	My teachers would be uneasy about consultants from the special education department spending time teaching and consulting.	9 41.7	6 25	8 33.3	1 4.2	0 0	0 0	# %

The sample was broken down into high school and elementary. Fifty percent of the high school principals were familiar with the Regular Education Initiative while seventy percent of the elementary teachers were familiar with Regular Education Initiative. Mainstreaming for at least part of the day is practiced by at least 66 percent of the high school special education students. This could be higher since 33 percent of the high school responding principals did not answer the question. In the elementary schools 79 percent of the special services students are mainstreamed. Fifty percent of the administrators in both elementary and secondary schools were knowledgeable in the area of Collaborative Consultation.

Both questionnaires that arrived after statistics were compiled were submitted by principals who were unfamiliar with Regular Education Initiative or Collaborative Consultation.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

It appears to me that building administrators do have a fairly positive attitude towards the Regular Education Initiative. The fact that one third were not familiar with Regular Education Initiative and half were unfamiliar with the Collaborative Consultation shows that either an in-service or some other informative method needs to be enacted so all administrators in the system are knowledgeable in this area.

The concept of the "Home School model" which is to be put into effect next school year will make this even more urgent. In this model the handicapped students will be allowed to return to their attendance center. In cases where the administrator is not informed, difficulties could result. Staff also needs to know about Regular Education Initiative, especially since the Department of Education, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitation is promoting the changes.

One attitudinal change would help promote enactment of the Regular Education Initiative. Most administrators disagreed with the statement that learning disabled students who have spatial and time orientation problems would profit from not having to go to a resource room. The idea that these students could be helped in the regular education classroom so they wouldn't have problems getting to another room at a specific time was not accepted by most.

I feel this attitude is due to wide acceptance of the resource room and pull-out services. More knowledge about learning disabilities could change this attitude.

I felt the reason most of the responding principals did not respond to the question on scheduling difficulties was an avoidance tactic. More education on this topic would help them find creative ways to schedule time for staff development, education, and collaborative consultation.

Bibliography

1. Braaten, B. and Braaten. (1988). Reform: For everyone. Special focus teaching exceptional children, 46-47.

2. Dillihunt, V. (1984, March). Tactics and factors that increase response rates. Memphis State University.

3. Greenburg, D. (1987). A special educator's perspective on interfacing special and general education: a review for administrators. A product of ERIC Clearinghouse on Handicapped and Gifted Children Published by the Council for Exceptional Children, 6-16.

4. Gruber, H. (1989, September). Comments on the regular education initiative, LDA Newsbriefs vol. 24, no. 5.

5. Habel, B. (1989, September). LDA Newsbriefs vol. 24, no. 5.

6. Lilly, M. (1986, March). Relationship between general and special education: A new face on an old issue. Counterpoint, 10.

7. O'Niel, J. (1988, September). How 'special' should the special ed curriculum be? Curriculum Update, Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1-8.

8. Peterson, J., Nielson, J., Dahl P., Johnson, J., Nystrom, E., Vaughan, E., (1985). Integrating students with special needs in regular classes: Teacher roles and student outcomes at the secondary level. Research and Development Center Reports to Educators. University of Pittsburgh, 1-19.

9. Pugach, M. (1988). Restructuring teaching. Special Focus. Teaching Exceptional Children. 47-49.

10. West, J. and Idol, L. (1990, January/February). Collaborative consultation in the education of mildly handicapped and at-risk students. R.A.S.E. Remedial and Special Education, vol. 11, Issue 1.

11. Sileo, T. and Johnson, M. (1987). Restructuring education: a district model to meet students learning needs. The Collaborative Educator, vol. 1, no. 4. 1, 8-9.

12. Wiederholt, J. (1989). Restructuring special education services: The past, the present, the future. Learning Disability Quarterly, vol. 12, 181-191.

13. U.S. Dept. of Education report to congress. (1984). 5.

14. Will, M. (1986). Clarifying the standards: Placement in a least restrictive environment. Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services; U.S. Department of Education, vol. 1, no. 2. 2-7.

15. Will, M. (1986, November). Educating students with learning problems - a shared responsibility. A report to the Secretary, Washington, D.C. 1-23.

16. Will, M. (1984). Let us pause and reflect -- but not too long. Exceptional Children, vol. 51, 11-16.

17. Statement by the teachers education division, position paper (1987, May). Journal of Learning Disabilities.

Appendices A

5951 Barry Avenue
Anchorage, Alaska 99516
April 4, 1990

John Doe
Slippery Rock Elementary School
6 th & Egan
Anchorage, Alaska 99505

Dear Mr. Doe:

I am working on my education research project. I am doing a study on the Regular Education Initiative in the Anchorage Public Schools. I am seeking information as to how the administrators in the Anchorage school district view this model and related attitudes.

I am asking you to complete the enclosed questionnaire. Questionnaires are being sent to all principals in the Anchorage. Completed questionnaires are to be returned by April 12, 1990. I have enclosed a stamped addressed envelope to return your questionnaire.

Thank you for your help. I am willing to share my findings, if you are interested or have questions contact me at 346-2645.

Sincerely,

Sylvia Kennedy

Sylvia Kennedy

Appendices B

REGULAR EDUCATION INITIATIVE
Questionnaire

On the following scale, respond to each of the following questions. Circle the response that most correctly expresses your feelings.
SA = Strongly Agree **A** = Agree **U** = Undecided **D** = Disagree **SD** = Strongly Disagree

1.	Special education students can be educated in a regular classroom with assistance from the special education department.	SA A U D SD
2.	Regular education teachers can be responsible for special education students.	SA A U D SD
3.	Least restrictive environment can be a self-contained classroom.	SA A U D SD
4.	Special education teachers in my building are protective of their students.	SA A U D SD
5.	An emotionally disturbed child can function only in a self-contained classroom.	SA A U D SD
6.	I believe labeling diminishes student self worth.	SA A U D SD
7.	I believe in-services are valuable for my staff.	SA A U D SD
8.	A principal must be knowledgeable in the area of current research.	SA A U D SD
9.	My staff work well with each other.	SA A U D SD
10.	Children model the behavior of other children.	SA A U D SD

11. Learning disabled students who have spatial and time orientation problems would profit from not having to go to a resource room. SA A U D SD

12. There is too much duplication of services between Chapter I, special education, bilingual and migrant services. SA A U D SD

Please complete to the best of your ability.

13. Are you familiar with the Regular Education Initiative? ☐ yes ☐ no

14. Are your special education students being taught in the regular classroom? ☐ yes ☐ no

15. If so, for what subjects?

16. Are you familiar with Collaborative Consultations? ☐ yes ☐ no

If you answered yes to questions 13 and 16, finish questions 17-20.

17. I feel too much staff money and resources has been allocated for this program. SA A U D SD

18. Scheduling difficulties make it impossible to enact Regular Education Initiative. SA A U D SD

19. Other support personnel (therapists) could take their services into a regular classroom. SA A U D SD

20. My teachers would be uneasy about consultants from the special education department spending time teaching and consulting. SA A U D SD